Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 17948-US-PA
Application No.: 10/691,565

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Presently pending claims 1-18 are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-5 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimori et al. (JP 2001-006879; hereinafter Fujimori). Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori. Claims 1-18 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujimori. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set for the below.

In the present invention, as for example shown in FIG. 2A, FIG. 2B, and FIG. 3, the buffer pad 13, 24 is located in the pixel area, and is between the first electrode 22 and the second electrode 26. The separating layer 14, 23 separates the pixel area.

The present invention introduces the buffer pad 13, 24 within the pixel area, so as to at least achieve several effects [0022].

Independent claim 1 recites the features as follows:

> 1. An organic electroluminescent device, comprising:
> a substrate;
> a first electrode disposed on the substrate;
> a second electrode disposed over the first electrode;
> at least one organic functional layer sandwiched between the first electrode and the second electrode; and
> *at least one buffer pad, which is nonconductive and is disposed in a pixel area*

sandwiched between the first electrode and the second electrode, wherein a height difference between the buffer pad and the first electrode is predetermined (Emphasis added).

Likewise, independent claim 10 recites the features as follows:

10. An electrode substrate for an organic electroluminescent device, comprising:
a substrate;
an electrode disposed on the substrate and has a plurality of pixel areas; and
at least one buffer pad, which is nonconductive and is disposed in the pixel areas, wherein a height difference between the buffer pad and the electrode is predetermined.

The emphasized features above are at least not disclose in prior art.

In.Re Fujimori, Fig. 7 is cross-sectional view in Fig. 6 at XX' direction. Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 show how the spacer 8 is formed in two different types. As described in [0028], the spacer 8 is formed above the insulating layer 3. In Fig. 6, the spacers 8 define some areas out. Then, the function layer 15 and the second electrode 14 are formed in the defined areas between the adjacent two spacers 8.

The Office Action refers to insulating layer 3 of Fujimori as the buffer pad of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Clearly, according to the disclosure in [0028] or Abstract of Fujimori, the insulating layer 3 is used together with the spacer 8, so as to define the area. In Fig. 6 (a top view of Fig. 8), there is no buffer pad being disclosed by Fujimori, so as at least to decrease the speed of the droplets

fallen into the pixel area Z....(specification [0022]).

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimori. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the same foregoing reasons applied to claim 1 and 10.

Furthermore, in order to at least achieve the effects described in [0022], the buffer pad is preferably less than 10 % of the total pixel area. Fujimori failed consider the effects of the present invention, and therefore does not disclose the condition of 10%. This is not the knowledge of the ordinary skill in the art, either.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 10 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 patently define over the prior art references as well. Wherein, claims 6 and 18 further define over the prior art.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 17948-US-PA
Application No.: 10/691,565

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-18 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date : Oct. 27, 2005

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

PAGE 6/6 * RCVD AT 10/28/2005 4:28:30 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):02-04